2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA PROBUILDERS SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY, RRG, Plaintiff, V. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, et al., Defendants. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, Third Party Plaintiff, V. RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Party Defendants.	1		Ĭ	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA PROBUILDERS SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY, RRG, Plaintiff, V. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, et al., Defendants. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, Third Party Plaintiff, V. RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Party Defendants	2			
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA PROBUILDERS SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY, RRG, Plaintiff, V. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, et al., Defendants. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, Third Party Plaintiff, V. RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Party Defendants.	3			
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA PROBUILDERS SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY, RRG, Plaintiff, v. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, et al., Defendants. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, Third Party Plaintiff, v. RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Party Defendants	4			
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA PROBUILDERS SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY, RRG, Plaintiff, V. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, et al., Defendants. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, Third Party Plaintiff, V. RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Party Defendants.	5	UNITED STATES D	ISTRICT COURT	
PROBUILDERS SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY, RRG, Plaintiff, V. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, et al., Defendants. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, Third Party Plaintiff, V. RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Party Defendants.	6	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
PROBUILDERS STECIALT I INSURANCE COMPANY, RRG, Plaintiff, ORDER GRANTING SUMMARY JUDGMENT TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, et al., Defendants. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, Third Party Plaintiff, V. RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Party Defendants	7			
Plaintiff, ORDER GRANTING SUMMARY JUDGMENT TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, et al., Defendants. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, Third Party Plaintiff, v. RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Party Defendants	8	PROBUILDERS SPECIALTY		
10 V. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, et al., Defendants. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, Third Party Plaintiff, V. RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Party Defendants	9	20 May 20	CASE NO. C11-418 BHS	
TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, et al., Defendants. TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, Third Party Plaintiff, V. RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Party Defendants	10	Plaintiff,	Seattle Council Street	
12 al., 13 Defendants. 14 TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, 15 Third Party Plaintiff, 16 V. 17 RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Party Defendants	11	v.		
TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC, Third Party Plaintiff, V. RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Party Defendants	12	N2 07		
Third Party Plaintiff, V. RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Party Defendents	13	Defendants.		
16 V. 17 RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Porty Defendents	14	TALBITZER CONSTRUCTION, LLC,		
RANDY WALKER and JANE DOE WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Porty Defendents	15	Third Party Plaintiff,		
WALKER, husband and wife, K.R. CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Porty Defendants	16	v.		
18 CONSULTANTS, LLC, Third Porty Defendents	17			
Third Party Defendants.	18			
A	19	Third Party Defendants.		
This matter somes before the Court on Bondy and Ione Doe Wellter, bushend and	20	This matter somes before the Count on	Pandy and Iona Dog Wallson byshand and	
This matter comes before the Court on Randy and Jane Doe Walker, husband and 21	21			
wife, and K.R. Consultants, LLC's ("Third Party Defendants") unopposed motion for	22	whe, and K.K. Consultants, LLC's ("Inird Par	try Detendants) unopposed motion for	

summary judgment (Dkt. 53). The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of the motion and the remainder of the file and hereby grants the motion for the reasons stated herein. On September 13, 2012, Third Party Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment arguing that there is no longer a basis for liability against them. Dkt. 53 at 2. Talbitzer filed no response. The underlying dispute arises out of a construction accident involving an injured worker, Daniel Saranto. Dkt. 1. Talbitzer Construction LLC ("Talbitzer"), the alleged general contractor on the project at which Saranto's accident occurred, filed a claim relating to Saranto's accident with ProBuilders Specialty Insurance Co., LLC ("ProBuilders"), with whom Talbitzer has a liability insurance policy. *Id.* at 2. ProBuilders filed this lawsuit seeking declaratory relief concerning its insurance coverage. See Dkt. 1. In May 2011, Talbitzer filed a third party claim against these Third Party Defendants, asserting that if it does not have coverage under ProBuilder's policy for the Saranto claim, the lack of coverage is allegedly due to negligence or breach of contract by third party defendants. See Dkt. 20. In August 2011, Talbitzer filed Chapter 11 bankruptcy. Dkt. 53-1 at 11-13. On August 9, 2012, Talbitzer's Chapter 11 bankruptcy plan was confirmed. *Id.* Under the plan, the only distributions are to be made to Allowed Claims. *Id.* at 12. Third Party Defendants argue that Saranto is not listed as an Allowed Claim holder. Dkt. 53 at 4. Further, they maintain that they have conferred with counsel for Talbitzer, who has indicated that Talbitzer has no further interest in this lawsuit and does not intend to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

pursue this third party claim. *Id.* The latter two contentions are supported by a declaration from the Third Party Defendants' counsel and have not been contradicted by Talbitzer. Dkt. 53-1 at 2.

Rule 7(b)(2) of the Local Rules states that "[i]f a party fails to file papers in opposition to a motion, such failure may be considered by the court as an admission that the motion has merit." However, in considering a motion for summary judgment, the motion should not be granted simply because there is no opposition, even if the failure to oppose violated a local rule. *See Henry v. Gill Indus.*, 983 F.2d 943, 950 (9th Cir. 1993). Rather, the moving party must demonstrate the absence of genuine issues of material fact, regardless of whether the party against whom the motion for summary judgment is directed has filed any opposition. *See Cristobal v. Siegel*, 26 F.3d 1488, 1491 (9th Cir. 1994).

Here, the Third Party Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment in which it demonstrates the absence of genuine issues of material fact and Talbitzer has failed to file an opposition. Accordingly, the Court concludes that Third Party Defendants' motion for summary judgment should be granted.

The Court, having considered the pleadings filed in support of the motion and the remainder of the file, does hereby **ORDER** that Third Party Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Dkt. 53) is **GRANTED** and the claims alleged by Talbitzer against Third Party Defendants are **DISMISSED** with **prejudice**.

1	Dated this 1 st day of November, 2012.	
2		101
3		
4	Land County	100000000000000000000000000000000000000
5	BENJAMIN H. SETTLE	
6	BENJAMIN H. SETTLE United States District Judge	S. Williams
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		81
14		
15		
16		
17		
17 18		
19		
20		
21		
22		